

Reply to Comment on “Electron Mass Operator in a Strong Magnetic Field and Dynamical Chiral Symmetry Breaking”

A. V. Kuznetsov* and N. V. Mikheev†
*Division of Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics,
 Yaroslavl State University, Sovietskaya 14,
 150000 Yaroslavl, Russian Federation*
 (Dated: July 10, 2002)

In the Letter [1] we have demonstrated a consistent calculation of the electron mass operator in a strong magnetic field in the leading-log approximation (LLA). It means that we have always neglected the terms $\sim \alpha^2 \ln(eB/m^2)$ and $\sim \alpha$ against the terms $\sim \alpha \ln(eB/m^2)$. This program has been successfully realized with the main result presented in Eq. (11).

The analysis has shown that the solution of Eq. (11) for the electron physical mass m was independent in strong fields on the initial field-free mass m_0 and was reduced in fact to the solution at $m_0 = 0$. The result (11) has been applied to a calculation of the fermion dynamical mass generated by a magnetic field, in a model with N charged fermions which were massless in the field-free limit. This treatment has led us to such unusual conclusions as an existence of a critical number of fermions in the theory, N_{cr} , such that the dynamical mass has not been arisen for $N > N_{cr}$ and it has been generated with a doublet splitting for $N < N_{cr}$.

The authors of the Comment [2] show, that taking into consideration of *a part* of the next-to-leading corrections changes the results fundamentally: no N_{cr} and no double splitting arise.

However, one can see that using of the “corrected” formula (2) of Ref. [2] instead of our approximate formula (12) of Ref. [1] is a little part of a step beyond the LLA. Really, the left-hand side of Eq. (2), Ref. [2], can be rewritten as

$$\left[\frac{\alpha_R}{2\pi} \left(\ln \frac{\pi}{N\alpha_R} - \gamma_E \right) + O(\alpha_R^2) \right] \ln \frac{eB}{m^2}. \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, such the next-to-leading terms $\sim \alpha_R^2 \ln(eB/m^2)$ have already been neglected, for example, when the truncated set of the Schwinger-Dyson equations was formulated. Namely, the reduction of the exact vertex in a strong magnetic field to the bare one, $\Gamma_\mu \rightarrow \gamma_\mu$, is valid in LLA only.

To give a conclusion on the dynamical mass generation by a strong magnetic field in the next-to-leading log approximation, one should consistently take such $\alpha^2 \ln$ corrections everywhere, and first, without the truncation of the Schwinger-Dyson equation set. To our knowledge, this program was not performed yet.

Regarding the renormalization of the coupling constant α_R , it follows directly (see, e.g. [3]) from the photon polarization operator in a strong magnetic field:

$$\mathcal{P} = \frac{N\alpha}{3\pi} q^2 f(\dots) - \frac{2N\alpha}{\pi} eB \exp\left(-\frac{q_\perp^2}{2eB}\right) H\left(\frac{q_\parallel^2}{4m^2}\right), \quad (2)$$

where the function $H(z)$ is presented in Eq.(9) of our Letter, and the function $f(q_\parallel^2, q_\perp^2, m^2, eB)$ has in general case the form of a double integral over the Fock-Schwinger proper times, and can be extracted from the papers by Tsai and Shabad cited in our Letter. In the limiting case regarding to our consideration, $q_\parallel^2, m^2 \ll q_\perp^2 \ll eB$, the function f is simplified, $f \simeq \ln(eB/m^2) - 1.792$. It immediately leads in the LLA to Eq.(13) of our Ref. [1]. In another limit, e.g. $q_\perp^2 \gg eB$, one has $f \simeq \ln(q_\perp^2/m^2) - 5/6$. In the LLA α_R appears to look like a field-free running coupling with the substitution $\mu^2 \rightarrow eB$, but in a general case it is a complicated function of the field strength and of the momenta $q_\perp^2, q_\parallel^2$. Thus, the statement made in the Comment that we took the running coupling from the one-loop RG equations in QED without a magnetic field, is incorrect.

We note also, that the specificity of our approach is the self-regulation of the “condition” $\alpha_R < \infty$ emphasized in the Comment.

We did not speculate in our Letter on possible physical consequences of an appearance of two different dynamical masses. Possibly, it would lead not only to two different theories, but rather to two different types of domains of our Universe.

* Electronic address: avkuzn@uniyar.ac.ru

† Electronic address: mikheev@uniyar.ac.ru

- [1] A. V. Kuznetsov and N. V. Mikheev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 011601 (2002).
- [2] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, and I. A. Shovkovy (2002), hep-ph/0206289.
- [3] A. V. Kuznetsov, N. V. Mikheev, and M. V. Osipov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **17**, 231 (2002).